
identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY









DATE: APR 0 6 2011

OFFICE: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

FILE: EAC 09 236 51419

IN RE:

Petitioner:

Beneficiary:

PETITION: Petition for a Non

Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(L) of the Immigration

and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(L)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew

Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Vermont Service Center, denied the petition for a nonimmigrant visa. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The AAO will dismiss the appeal.

The petitioner is a New Jersey corporation that filed a nonimmigrant visa petition seeking to continue the employment of its executive manager for an additional two years as an L-1A nonimmigrant intracompany transferee pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(L) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(L).

The director denied the petition based on two adverse findings: 1) the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary would be employed in the United States in a managerial or executive capacity; and 2) the record lacks evidence to establish that the petitioner was doing business at the time of filing the petition.

On appeal, counsel challenges the director's findings, asserting that the director ignored relevant evidence establishing that the petitioner is a viable business entity and that the beneficiary's proposed employment would be in a managerial or executive capacity, involving primarily managerial job duties. Counsel also checked off the box in the Form I-290B indicating that an appellate brief or additional information would be provided in support of the appeal. To date, however, approximately sixteen months since the appeal was filed, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services has received no supplemental information in support of the appeal. Therefore, the AAO will consider the record complete as presently constituted.

To establish L-1 eligibility under section 101(a)(15)(L) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(L), the petitioner must demonstrate that the beneficiary, within three years preceding the beneficiary's application for admission into the United States, has been employed abroad in a qualifying managerial or executive capacity, or in a capacity involving specialized knowledge, for one continuous year by a qualifying organization and seeks to enter the United States temporarily in order to continue to render his or her services to the same employer or a subsidiary or affiliate thereof in a capacity that is managerial, executive, or involves specialized knowledge.

Regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) state, in pertinent part:

An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.

In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Inasmuch as counsel has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact in this proceeding, the petitioner has not sustained that burden. Therefore, the appeal will be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.